

[18th October 1927]

*Increments to unpassed clerks.*

\* 515 Q.—MR. J. A. SALDANHA : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Board of Revenue has allowed some unpassed clerks to draw increments with effect from 1st March 1925; if so, what are the special reasons therefor;

(b) whether some other unpassed clerks who were exempted at the same time or before and who are on the same footing have been shown differential treatment;

(c) what action the Government have taken or propose to take to remove the inequality prevailing in this matter;

(d) whether it is a fact that increments are sanctioned for approved service;

(e) whether it is a fact that even acting clerks without any substantial appointment are allowed the benefit of time-scale; if so, what is the chief criterion for the grant of increments to them; and by what rules is their case governed;

(f) whether Government have considered the length of approved service put in by the exempted unpassed clerks and allowed them to draw increments with retrospective effect only in cases where they were confirmed prior to 1st March 1921, and in view of the fact that they had once been allowed to draw increments for more than a year without any objection either by the Government or by the Accountant-General;

(g) whether it is a fact that the increments drawn by and subsequently recovered from certain clerks of the Revenue Department in South Kanara district were not refunded in full as per assurance given by the hon. the Member for Revenue in his speech dated 10th July 1926 but only the increments drawn from March to July 1923, and if so, why;

(h) when the orders were issued by the Collector to recover from the clerks the amounts of increments already overdrawn for the first time;

(i) whether it is a fact that in all other departments increments drawn from 1st March 1923 to February, 1925 have either been waived or refunded to them;

(j) whether the Government will be pleased to state the total number of unpassed clerks exempted by the heads of departments and the Government respectively from 4th February 1925 to 4th November 1926;

(k) the number of exempted unpassed clerks among these who had drawn increments for a year or more and who subsequently refunded the same; and

(l) the probable expenditure to be incurred by giving their exemption order retrospective effect?

A.—(a) Yes: through a misunderstanding of the orders in G.O. No. 164, Law (Education), dated 4th February 1925.

(b) & (c) The Government are not aware of the differential treatment or inequality referred to by the hon. Member.

(d) Yes.

(e) Yes. They are eligible for increments under Fundamental Rule 26 (a) and provided they are qualified and their service is approved.

18th October 1927]

- (f) In all cases which were brought to the notice of Government they held that retrospective effect should not be given to the orders granting exemption and that service for purposes of increment should count only from the date of exemption. Where, however, in consequence of increments having been drawn unauthorisedly a clerk was drawing more pay than he was entitled to, the recovery of any sum overdrawn in the past has been waived by the Government and the clerk permitted to remain on his present rate of pay; but he is not eligible for another increment until it is due calculating increments from the date of exemption.
- (g) & (h) The Government are not aware of the cases to which the hon. Member refers unless it be that he refers to cases coming under the second sentence of paragraph 3 (v) of G.O. No. 773, Law (Education), dated 3rd May 1926.
- (i) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to paragraph 3 (v) of G.O. No. 773, Law (Education), dated 3rd May 1926.
- (j), (k) & (l) The Government have no information immediately available.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" With reference to the answer to clause (a), 'through a misunderstanding of the orders in G.O. No. 164, Law (Education), dated 4th February 1925', I want to enquire, Sir, whether the orders were clear enough as not to be misunderstood? "

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—" Quite so, Sir, they were."

*Revision of the Government Order regarding minimum qualifications for public service.*

\* 516 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received memorials requesting them to alter the recent order relating to the minimum marks to be obtained in the Secondary School-Leaving Certificate examination for being eligible for permanent Government appointments; and if so, how many, and from what departments;

(b) whether the order referred to above has affected a large number of acting clerks, and if so, how many in each department; and

(c) whether the Government are considering the desirability of changing the order, and if so, when the revising order may be expected, and to what effect?

A.—(a) Memorials were received by the Government for the amendment of G.O. No. 965, Public, dated 16th November 1926, from officers under six departments. Statistics as regards the number of memorials are not available.

(b) The Government have no particulars as to the numbers of acting clerks affected in each department.

(c) The question is under consideration whether the standard recognized by the University as qualifying for a college course should also be recognized by the Government as an alternative qualification for Government service. It is not possible to say whether a revising order will issue.